



CENTRAL INTELLIGENCE AGENCY
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20505

OLC 74-1124

29 MAY 1974

Honorable John L. McClellan, Chairman
Subcommittee on Intelligence Operations
Committee on Appropriations
United States Senate
Washington, D. C. 20510

Dear Mr. Chairman:

Your efforts on behalf of this Agency during the Senate Judiciary Committee's consideration of S. 2543 are deeply appreciated. The reported out version of the bill, containing as it does a new paragraph (4) (B) (ii) in section 552(a) of Title 5 of the United States Code, provides the necessary minimum presumptions needed to protect information involving sensitive Intelligence Sources and Methods.

I do not believe that the nation's best interests are served by a presumption that sensitive Intelligence Sources and Methods critically affecting the national security are properly subject to a detailed court review on the basis of a suit to publish such information which can be brought by any person regardless of citizenship. Therefore, should the accommodation affecting this Agency, as reflected in new paragraph (4) (B) (ii) not be supported by the full Senate, then I have no recourse but to respectfully and strongly urge the amendment I proposed in my 30 April 1974 letter to you providing special recognition for information which is protected from unauthorized disclosure by statute, such as Restricted Data, Intelligence Sources and Methods, and Communications Intelligence.

Sincerely,

/s/ W. E. Colby

W. E. Colby
Director

Distribution:

Original - Addressee

1 - DCI

1 - DDCI

1 - ER

1 - Approved for Release 2001/08/30 : CIA-RDP75B00380R000600190012-7

OLC/LLM:jmd (30 May 74)

CENTRAL INTELLIGENCE AGENCY
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20505

30 April 1974

Honorable John L. McClellan, Chairman
Intelligence Operations Subcommittee
Committee on Appropriations
United States Senate
Washington, D. C. 20510

Dear Mr. Chairman:

This letter responds to your request for comments on the possible impact upon the operations of this Agency of S. 2543 which amends the Freedom of Information Act (5 U.S.C. 522).

Presently, this Agency's records are for the most part not available for public inspection because the Act exempts, among other things, matters that are:

"(b)(1) specifically required by Executive order to be kept secret in the interest of the national defense or foreign policy;

(3) specifically exempted from disclosure by statute;"

Although S. 2543 retains these general exemptions, it adds a new provision which would permit an in camera court review of any or all records to determine whether they shall be subject to public inspection. This provision appears to be designed to overrule a Supreme Court decision that the contents of records withheld under exemption (b)(1) are not reviewable by the courts (Environmental Protection Agency v. Mink, 93 S. Ct. 827 (1973)).

The National Security Act of 1947 provides:

"... That the Director of Central Intelligence shall be responsible for protecting intelligence sources and methods from unauthorized disclosure;" (Sec. 102(d)(3))

This language is designed to protect the lives and welfare of sources of sensitive foreign intelligence information and to protect against the compromise of technical collection efforts.

I do not believe that the nation's interest would best be served by legislation which would make it possible for the most sensitive of Agency records to be subject to court review as a result of a suit by an individual, who under the statute may not even be a U.S. citizen, for their public inspection. It is recommended that information which is made inherently sensitive by statute be exempted from the court review provisions of S. 2543. Suggested language accomplishing this for three categories of sensitive information recognized by statute (Intelligence Sources and Methods, Communications Intelligence and Restricted Data) is enclosed.

If S. 2543 or similar legislation is favorably considered, it is hoped that you would be able to support appropriate exemption for this Agency as proposed.

Sincerely,

/s/

W. E. Colby
Director

AMENDMENT TO S. 2543 (Committee Print, January 29, 1974)

The added language is underlined and would be inserted at line 16, page 3:

"(B) On complaint, the district court of the United States in the district in which the complainant resides, or has his principal place of business, or in which the agency records are situated, or in the District of Columbia, has jurisdiction to enjoin the agency from withholding agency records and to order the production of any agency records improperly withheld from the complainant. In such a case the court shall consider the case de novo, with, except for matters withheld under section 552(b)(3), involving, but not limited to, Restricted Data, intelligence sources and methods, and communication intelligence under sections 2162 of Title 42, 403(d)(3) and 403g of Title 50, 798 of Title 18 and 73 Stat. 64, such in camera examination of the requested records as it finds appropriate to determine whether such records or any part thereof may be withheld under any of the exemptions set forth in subsection (b) of this section, and the burden is on the agency to sustain its action.

INTELLIGENCE SOURCES AND METHODS, RESTRICTED DATA,
AND COMMUNICATION INTELLIGENCE UNDER THE PROPOSED
FREEDOM OF INFORMATION ACT AMENDMENTS

Problem: Aide-Memoire

Senate Report: Recognition of Special
Categories of Sensitive Information (Tab A)

House Report: Recognition of Statutory
("born classified") Sensitive Information (Tab B)

S. 2543, Reported Provision (Tab C)

Excerpt Senator Kennedy's Comments on
S. 2543 Committee Report (Tab D)

Letter to Senator McClellan (Tab E)

AIDE- MEMOIRE

Amendments to Proposed Freedom of Information Act Amendments

S. 2543

1. Section (b)(1) of S. 2543 as amended in Committee would overrule the decision of the Supreme Court in the Environmental Protection Agency v. Mink, 93 S. Ct. 827 (1973), by authorizing court review of the contents of records withheld by a Federal agency under the nine specific exemptions set forth in Title 5 U.S.C.A. 552(b). The purpose of such review would be to determine if the information withheld meets the criteria of the exemption involved.
2. Matters specifically exempted from public inspection by section 552(b) of the Freedom of Information Act include those "specifically required by Executive Order to be kept secret in the interest of the national defense or foreign policy" [552(b)(1)]. It was this exemption which was at issue in the Mink case. A separate exemption from public inspection is afforded matters "specifically exempted from disclosure by statute" [552(b)(3)].
3. There is an important distinction between these two exemptions. The former refers to classification of information under Executive Order, which specifies criteria for evaluating and classifying governmental documents. The latter exemption, based upon express statutory authority, involves an act of Congress approved by the President which directs the proper handling of especially sensitive information. Three such categories of information are: Restricted Data [42 U.S.C.A. 2162], relating to atomic energy matters; Communication Intelligence [18 U.S.C.A. 798]; and Intelligence Sources and Methods [50 U.S.C.A. 403(d)(3) and g]. It should be made abundantly clear that it is not the intent of Congress to encourage or authorize a detailed court review of information which has been specifically designated in an act of Congress as deserving of statutory protection. This distinction is recognized by the Judiciary Committee in its report on S. 2543 (Tab A). The House report on H.R. 12471, a similar bill, also recognized this distinction for Restricted Data (Tab B).

4. As reported out, S. 2543 recognizes that with respect to sensitive information a presumption should be accorded by the court to an agency head who has personally examined and determined that the records in question are secret. Senator Kennedy in a floor statement has noted this requirement (Tab D) which is also commented upon in greater detail in the Committee report (Tab A).
5. If S. 2543 as reported is amended to drop the procedures for the in camera court review recommended by the Committee, adoption of the Agency's original position (Tab E) is strongly urged.

A

Excerpt from Senate Judiciary Committee

Report on S. 2543

By statute certain special categories of sensitive information—Restricted Data (42 U.S.C. § 2162), Communication Intelligence (18 U.S.C. § 798), and Intelligence Sources and Methods (50 U.S.C. § 403 (d)(3) and (g))—must be given special protection from unauthorized disclosure. These categories of information have been exempted from public inspection under section 552(b)(3), “specifically exempted from disclosure by statute,” and (b)(1), “specifically required by Executive Order to be kept secret in the interest of the national defense or foreign policy.” The Committee believes that these categories of information will be adequately protected under S. 2543. If such information is ever subject to court review, the review will be conducted in camera under the procedures established in the bill for information exempt under section 552(b)(1), which has been amended to include matters specifically required to be kept secret “by an Executive Order or statute.” It is also expected that in such cases the court will recognize that such information is inherently sensitive and that the latitude for discretion permitted under Executive Order 11652 does not apply to such information.

The specific procedures delineated in section 552(a)(4)(B)(ii) apply only to cases where exemption (b)(1) is invoked.

House Report 93-876

Page 8

Even with the broader language of these amendments as they apply to exemption (b)(1), information may still be protected under the exemption of 552(b)(3): "specifically exempted from disclosure by statute." This would be the case, for example, with the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended. It features the "born classified" concept. This means that there is no administrative discretion to classify, if information is defined as "restricted data" under that Act, but only to declassify such data.

The *in camera* provision is permissive and not mandatory. It is the intent of the committee that each court be free to employ whatever means it finds necessary to discharge its responsibilities.

Court Review Provision in S. 2543

C

11 “(B)(i) On complaint, the district court of the United
12 States in the district in which the complainant resides, or
13 has his principal place of business, or in which the agency
14 records are situated, or in the District of Columbia, has juris-
15 diction to enjoin the agency from withholding agency records
16 and to order the production of any agency records improperly
17 withheld from the complainant. In such a case the court shall
18 consider the case de novo, with such in camera examination
19 of the requested records as it finds appropriate to determine
20 whether such records or any part thereof may be withheld
21 under any of the exemptions set forth in subsection (b) of
22 this section, and the burden is on the agency to sustain its
23 action.

24 “(ii) In determining whether a document is in fact spe-
25 cifically required by an Executive order or statute to be kept

(continued on next page)

Court Review Provision in S. 2543 (continued)

1 *secret in the interest of national defense or foreign policy,*
2 *a court may review the contested document in camera if it is*
3 *unable to resolve the matter on the basis of affidavits and other*
4 *information submitted by the parties. In conjunction with*
5 *its in camera examination, the court may consider further*
6 *argument, or an ex parte showing by the Government, in ex-*
7 *planation of the withholding. If there has been filed in the*
8 *record an affidavit by the head of the agency certifying that*
9 *he has personally examined the documents withheld and has*
10 *determined after such examination that they should be with-*
11 *held under the criteria established by a statute or Executive*
12 *order referred to in subsection (b)(1) of this section, the*
13 *court shall sustain such withholding unless, following its in*
14 *camera examination, it finds the withholding is without a rea-*
15 *sonable basis under such criteria.*

Excerpt from Senator Kennedy's Floor Comments on
Judiciary Committee Report on S. 2543

Where agencies want to withhold documents under a statute or Executive order as being classified in the interest of national defense or foreign policy S. 2543 as amended provides that courts may examine the documents themselves in camera and must determine whether in fact the documents were properly classified. The bill sets out procedures to protect particularly sensitive information, and it provides that courts should utilize an in camera examination only if they cannot resolve the matter on the basis of arguments and affidavits. But it firmly establishes the principle of judicial review of—and accountability outside the executive branch for—agency decisions to classify material.

D

Congressional Record, May 16, 1974
Page S 8347

CENTRAL INTELLIGENCE AGENCY
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20505

30 April 1974

Honorable John L. McClellan, Chairman
Intelligence Operations Subcommittee
Committee on Appropriations
United States Senate
Washington, D. C. 20510

Dear Mr. Chairman:

This letter responds to your request for comments on the possible impact upon the operations of this Agency of S. 2543 which amends the Freedom of Information Act (5 U.S.C. 522).

Presently, this Agency's records are for the most part not available for public inspection because the Act exempts, among other things, matters that are:

"(b)(1) specifically required by Executive order to be kept secret in the interest of the national defense or foreign policy;

(3) specifically exempted from disclosure by statute;"

Although S. 2543 retains these general exemptions, it adds a new provision which would permit an in camera court review of any or all records to determine whether they shall be subject to public inspection. This provision appears to be designed to overrule a Supreme Court decision that the contents of records withheld under exemption (b)(1) are not reviewable by the courts (Environmental Protection Agency v. Mink, 93 S. Ct. 827 (1973)).

The National Security Act of 1947 provides:

"... That the Director of Central Intelligence shall be responsible for protecting intelligence sources and methods from unauthorized disclosure;" (Sec. 102(d)(3))

This language is designed to protect the lives and welfare of sources of sensitive foreign intelligence information and to protect against the compromise of technical collection efforts.

I do not believe that the nation's interest would best be served by legislation which would make it possible for the most sensitive of Agency records to be subject to court review as a result of a suit by an individual, who under the statute may not even be a U.S. citizen, for their public inspection. It is recommended that information which is made inherently sensitive by statute be exempted from the court review provisions of S. 2543. Suggested language accomplishing this for three categories of sensitive information recognized by statute (Intelligence Sources and Methods, Communications Intelligence and Restricted Data) is enclosed.

If S. 2543 or similar legislation is favorably considered, it is hoped that you would be able to support appropriate exemption for this Agency as proposed.

Sincerely,

/s/

W. E. Colby
Director

AMENDMENT TO S. 2543 (Committee Print, January 29, 1974)

The added language is underlined and would be inserted at line 16, page 3:

"(B) On complaint, the district court of the United States in the district in which the complainant resides, or has his principal place of business, or in which the agency records are situated, or in the District of Columbia, has jurisdiction to enjoin the agency from withholding agency records and to order the production of any agency records improperly withheld from the complainant. In such a case the court shall consider the case de novo, with, except for matters withheld under section 552(b)(3), involving, but not limited to, Restricted Data, intelligence sources and methods, and communication intelligence under sections 2162 of Title 42, 403(d)(3) and 403g of Title 50, 798 of Title 18 and 73 Stat. 64, such in camera examination of the requested records as it finds appropriate to determine whether such records or any part thereof may be withheld under any of the exemptions set forth in subsection (b) of this section, and the burden is on the agency to sustain its action.

Bill full

☐ UNCLASSIFIED ☐ INTERNAL USE ONLY ☐ CONFIDENTIAL ☐ SECRET

ROUTING AND RECORD SHEET

SUBJECT: (Optional)

FROM:

Acting Legislative Counsel

EXTENSION

6121

NO.

DATE 29 May 1974

TO: (Officer designation, room number, and building)

DATE

RECEIVED

FORWARDED

OFFICER'S INITIALS

COMMENTS (Number each comment to show from whom to whom. Draw a line across column after each comment.)

1. Director

2.

3.

4.

5.

6.

7.

8.

9.

10.

11.

12.

13.

14.

15.

Recommend that you sign the attached letter to Chairman McClellan thanking him for his efforts on our behalf on the Freedom of Information Act amendments which are scheduled for consideration on the floor tomorrow. The real point of the letter is to view with alarm the possibility that the compromise which came out of the Committee and with which we can live might be defeated by an amendment by Muskie.

When I return from the White House this afternoon, I will have a better idea as to other likely targets for a personal contact by you, such as Senators Hruska, Pastore, Jackson, Stennis, Scott, Young, Dominick, Thurmond and Eastland. Unfortunately, Senator Symington is a co-sponsor of the Muskie amendment but we might consider getting our package (attached) to him. We are also drafting up some floor statements for possible use by some members.

25X1A

Acting Legislative Counsel

Approved For Release 2001/08/30 : CIA-RDP75E00380R000600190012-7